

Remarks

In the final Office Action dated November 28, 2008, claims 1, 3, 5-9, 11, 13, 14, 16, 18-22, 24, and 26 are pending and claims 1, 3, 5-9, 11, 13, 14, 16, 18-22, 24, and 26 stand finally rejected. The Applicants have amended claims 1, 7, 14, and 20 and have included a Request For Continued Examination (RCE) in this Response. The Applicants traverse the rejection set forth by the Examiner.

35 USC § 103 Rejection

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3, 5-9, 11, 13, 14, 16, 18-22, 24, and 26 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Number RE37,258 in view of US Patent Publication Number 2003/0023590 (Atkin). The Applicants submit that the art cited by the Examiner does not render the claims obvious.

A print stream contains various representations of data to be printed. For example, the print stream may contain pictures, simple text, or in some cases, complex text such as Unicode complex text. Unicode complex text is an encoding standard used to represent many different character sets and glyphs (pictorial represented languages, such as Chinese or Hebrew). Some languages are printed and read from left to right, and others are printed and read from right to left. In some cases, portions of languages require that the left to right or right to left orientations change depending on what characters are being printed. In the case of Unicode complex text, this is accomplished by processing the Unicode complex text print stream to modify the character placements on a page layout. Because processing the Unicode complex print stream requires computational effort, it may be desirable to disable this processing for print draft or print proofing operations.

Claim 1 recites a method of controlling downstream processing of Unicode complex text in a print stream. According to the method, a print stream including a section of Unicode complex text is received. The section of the Unicode complex text in the print stream is identified. A control parameter is inserted in the print stream before the section of the Unicode complex text to modify the print stream. The control parameter comprises a first parameter and a second parameter. The first parameter indicates a type of downstream processing for the section of the Unicode complex text identified in the print stream. The second parameter enables

and disables the type of downstream processing of the section of Unicode complex text identified in the print stream. The modified print stream is transmitted for downstream processing.

Atkin discloses mechanisms for including metadata in a Unicode character stream using tags inserted in the stream (Abstract). In Atkins, the suggested tags include 97 new Unicode characters. The tags allow for the construction of simple parsers for separating the metadata from the Unicode character stream data since there is no overloading of characters (Paragraph 44). One tag disclosed is a "cancel" tag. The "cancel" tag cancels other tag values. Atkins further discloses that if the "cancel" tag is transmitted without another tag, the effect is to cancel any and all processed tag values (Paragraph 46).

The Applicants submit that Atkins does not teach or reasonably suggest the limitation of "a second parameter for enabling and disabling the type of downstream processing of the section of Unicode complex text identified in the print stream" as recited in claim 1. The Examiner suggests that Atkins teaches tags indicating a type of downstream processing and that the cancel tag can be used to enable or disable the type of downstream processing. The Applicants respectfully disagree. Atkins discloses that a tag value continues until it either implicitly goes out of scope or a cancel tag is found (Paragraph 47). That is, the cancel tag is used to mark the end of tag value processing in the Unicode character stream. This is clearly illustrated in the Table 4 example usage of the language tag, which marks the beginning of French language text in the Unicode character stream and uses the cancel tag to mark the end of the French language text in the Unicode character stream. Additionally, although Atkins suggests that the cancel tag can be used to cancel all processed tag values, there is no teaching or suggestion in Atkins that the cancel tag can both enable and disable processing of a section of Unicode complex text. For example, Atkins discloses a direction tag ("DIR", Paragraph 106) which takes directional arguments of either "L" (left segment direction) or "R" (right segment direction). Nothing in Atkins teaches or suggests that the "DIR" tag can somehow be modified with a "cancel" tag to both enable processing of the segment using the indicated "L" or "R" direction information and additionally disable processing of the segment using the indicated "L" or "R" direction information.

The Examiner has further indicated that Patel fails to teach a parameter indicating a type of downstream processing and a parameter enabling or disabling processing, of which the Applicants agree. The Applicants therefore submit that claim 1 is non-obvious in view of the

cited art for at least the reasons provided above. Independent claims 7, 14, and 20 are non-obvious for at least the same reasons. Dependent claims 3, 5-6, 8-9, 11, 13, 16, 18-19, 21-22, 24, and 26 are non-obvious for at least depending on base claims 1, 7, 14, and 20.

Conclusion

The Applicants submit that the art cited by the Examiner does not render claims 1, 3, 5-9, 11, 13, 14, 16, 18-22, 24, and 26 obvious, and therefore respectfully ask the Examiner to allow claims 1, 3, 5-9, 11, 13, 14, 16, 18-22, 24, and 26.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 2, 2009

/Sean J. Varley/

SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER

Sean J. Varley, Reg. No. 62,397

Duft Bornsen & Fishman, LLP

Telephone: (303) 786-7687

Facsimile: (303) 786-7691

Customer No.: 50441